

**REMARKS**

Responsive to the Office Action of November 26, 2002, applicant has here presented again for examination claim 2 in its unamended form, i.e. in the form it had before the Amendment filed September 17, 2002, as claim 85. Applicant and his counsel do not understand the PTO's assertion that claim 2 as amended, and claims 78 to 84, are not readable on the elected invention. Claim 2 as amended includes the diagnostic step that begins with the phrase "localizing the disorder..." and the diagnostic step that appeared in claim 2 before its amendment. In addition, the PTO's assertion that the depending claims are directed to treating patentably distinct disease states is not understood. All of these claims are dependant on claim 2 and each of these claims comprises a step in furtherance of the diagnostic and treatment steps set forth in claim 2 as amended.

Applicant's counsel respectfully requests a telephone interview with PTO Examiner Travers, following the filing of this Amendment, to seek clarification of Examiner Travers' assertions in an effort to respond fully and in good faith, and will initiate such a call in the week beginning January 5, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

*Patrick F. Bright* 

Dated: December 23, 2002

Patrick F. Bright,  
Reg. No. 24,318  
BRIGHT & LORIG, P.C.  
633 West 5th St., Ste 3330  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Tel: 213.627.7774  
Fax: 213.627.8508